

ENGLISH EXTRACTS.

(From the London Times, November 9.)

THE New York Herald says.—It is now generally believed that there is a difference between the President and a portion of his cabinet, not only on the tariff on the Oregon question, but also that those who disagree are Mr. Buchanan, Mr. Marcy, and Mr. Bancroft, the others siding with him. It is very evident, from the movements of a certain portion of the democratic party in Pennsylvania, in relation to the tariff, that Mr. Buchanan's friends, if they are guided by his opinions are very hostile to the present position of the administration.

The same journal has the following relative to the potato disease:—

"In all those sections where the disease prevailed last year, or some of it has been experienced the present year has been a year of comparative safety. In Canada, Nova Scotia, and perhaps a part of Maine, where it did not

OCCUPATION LICENSES. An eleven o'clock, of Thursday, 23rd April, the Ontario Government has issued a notice to the Colonial Treasurer, in Sydney, the licensee to occupy, under the regulations of 21st August, 1901, the land in the Colony of New South Wales, from the 1st May, 1906. Further information respecting the land may be obtained from the Surveyor General, and respecting the regulations from the Colonial Treasurer. The highest price for each lot is £5 per section of 640 acres, and the lowest is £1 per section of 640 acres. The Canadian accounts of a melancholy

WELLINGTON.—S. 950 acres, parish of Omanga, 9, 1080 acres, same place. 10. 410 acres, same place, near the head of the Pigeon Ponds, No 15 in that parish. 11.—13. 990 acres each, at Curruharu Creek.

PRINCE.—14. 640 acres, near Coggan. 15. 700 acres, same place. 16. 950 acres, at Drummer's Flat.

QUEENSLAND.—17. 640 acres, near the Dip Hole Flat. 18. 950 acres, near Mul Kwa.

KING.—19. 900 acres, near Grabine, at Wangala Flat. 20. 640 acres, at Wangala Flat. 21. 1100 acres, near the Lachlan River. 22.

BOAT LICENSE—PORT MAQUARRE. The license for the motor launch "Avalon," owned by Mr. J. J. O'Brien, of Port Macquarie, was renewed for the year ending 31st March, 1936. Further information may be obtained from the Surveyor-General, Port Macquarie, or the Police Officer in Charge, Port Macquarie, at the Police Office of the district. The upset price is £6 per section of the license.

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

The Journal des Débats says—"Although the prisoners of war taken from the army of Langier, make no mention of any revolt in Morocco, there is, nevertheless, every reason to believe that the army of the Sultan, on its part of the kingdom comprised between the mountains of Taza and the mountains of the Rif, has been the theatre of a revolt. A French officer, M. de Lamoignon, who has been in the Sultan's army, states that the triumph of the *Beni-Sidi-Brham*, the exhibition of the 200 heads of the Sultan's army, and the capture of the Sultan's camp, moreover, that of the 800 prisoners of war, are the result of a general insurrection, and that the Sultan has been obliged to send him a large force to give with satisfactory precision the news of the success of his arms. It is not to be supposed, however, that I am now about to offend the feelings of the Sultan, by saying that he has been deceived by his slaves. By whose hands the Sultan's army has been put in publication, been made? By Dr. M'Caffrey, himself an informed and a true man, who has been the prisoner of the Sultan, and who was disposed to give him a hearing; as such a man may judge, by the extent of the commotion, that the Sultan's army has been the theatre of a revolt, and not without a liberal allowance of the *sherd*, aids for its convenient elucida-

Private advices from Monte Video to the 19th of September, and from Buenos Ayres to the 29th of August, have been received per passenger.

The allied Powers still continued vigorous operations. The port of Colonia, in possession of the troops of Rosas, had been captured, after a few shots, on the 31st of August, and subsequently the forts of Puntales, and the remaining ports of the Banda Oriental, were seized by Oribe—the Buco, Maldonado, &c.—had been placed under vigorous blockade.

The two great rivers—the Uruguay and the Rio de la Plata—have been surveyed for some distance by the Argentine Government, and the results have been made known to British officers, and it was currently reported that besides using the Uruguay for the purpose of navigation, the Argentine Government had intended to insist on the opening of the river at the close of the struggle. We have seen that the Argentine Government, as well as the British Government, were anxious to see the river open to the navigation of the world, which belongs just as much to Monte Video as to Buenos Ayres. It is not, however, after what the Earl of Aberdeen has said on the subject, the least probable that the Argentine Government, at the last session of Parliament, intended to insist on the opening of the river at the close of the struggle. We have seen that the Argentine Government, as well as the British Government, were anxious to see the river open to the navigation of the world, which belongs just as much to Monte Video as to Buenos Ayres. It is not, however, after what the Earl of Aberdeen has said on the subject, the least probable that the Argentine Government, at the last session of Parliament, intended to insist on the opening of the river at the close of the struggle.

[illegible]

on the ground that the west would not consent to such an arrangement.

It is my opinion that the Mormons may be considered at an end. The Mormons have pledged themselves, verbally and in writing, not to molest the Indians of the West. General Hardin, in his letter communicating the arrangement, says it is the intention of the Mormons to locate themselves west of the Rocky Mountains.

All accounts from Pennsylvania concur in the opinion that the interest on the State debt, which was due on the 1st February, will be promptly paid.

gent cases which require my immediate attendance, and one in particular, about seamen, who are to be sent to the West. I must leave before night? I fear I shall not be enabled to return before my clock. This hour was accordingly rung, and my understanding of the matter was that Dr. H. would be present for the consultation so early that a note to be sent to my house to advise my return would be necessary.

I returned home by half-past seven, finding that no communication had arrived from the West, and that I had not been able to find a fresh vehicle to make various other errands.

signed F. M'Crae, M.D., embodying a correspondence between him and myself, as well as certain alleged facts not contained in that correspondence, renders not necessary that I should have been present at the meeting in your columns to the following remarks on the above paper;—and, let, as to the assigned motive of the present publication of the above correspondence—namely, that the correspondence in question is handed about, and is not a communication in *form*, but a *fact*, but injurious to the reputation (of the writer of the statement, Dr. M'Crae), are in general circulation.

of the correspondence. A meeting of some of my medical friends was at this time convened, at their own request, in consequence of their having heard of the correspondence—from its having been shown to another medical gentleman by Dr. McCræ —when it was agreed that as it was to a great extent clearly a professional question, it was desirable that some copies of it should be perfectly attained. Both attended, and proposed our going up stairs to the patient when nothing particular occurred, except the arrival of Mr. —, the gentleman first proposed by Dr. McCræ, whom I pressed to join us (notwithstanding my original reluctance to our meeting), from feeling that we had suggested the calling in of Mr. A. B. —, although that gentleman had declined coming, I ought neither directly nor

without giving any intimation or my observing him, opened the door, and, as he admitted, he was not in the least surprised to find the first time became acquainted with the difference of opinion that had existed between him and Mr. McCrae, and that he was in consequence of Dr. McCrae's own act, he no longer concealed—as at the time of Mr. McCrae's death, he had done—his feelings serving to Dr. Richardson that I would willingly desist from pressing my views if I did not feel that I was bound to do so.

On the following day, I called at the time appointed, waited a few minutes, apologized for my inability to stay longer, and returned to my home. On the 17th January 1981, by communication, of date 17th January last, alleging that there were "circumstances

[illegible]

reply, "I have said to Dr. M. C. 'own ad-
mission, he informed that I did not leave
him' (I still had) and I have said, 'I
with the explanation I have given, above, is
quite sufficient utterly to disprove the second
charge; inasmuch as it must be obvious to
any one acquainted with the distances of the
places which I had to visit, that I could not
have arrived at Mr. A.'s 'office' earlier
than the hour I have specified.

To this second charge I gave a direct an-
swer. But admitting that I had arrived at that
person's house a few minutes before the time
mentioned, an ineffably contemptible mis-
take, I should have been able to show that

No. 8, is the grievous sin of my having
grated, in the way that I have above
mentioned, the calling in of Mr. A. Beckett
charge I have already replied. I believe

The next alleged fact stated in this
sure, namely, "that it was I who ch
you before Dr. Richardson with sug
that Mr. A. Beckett should be called i
valuable, because it directly proves w
had seen Mr. A. Beckett, and that
which should have been numbered 5
Dr. M. C. was aware of my having do
on the only occasion on which Dr. Ric

imputations, in connection with the above charges, I did not only go to the house of the patient, but also, at the same time, but that then and in his absence I had gone into her sick chamber, remained there for some time, and, without her knowledge, denounced his treatment as inefficient, and recommended my own as that alone which would be successful.

It is true that in his reply (containing an enclosure from Mr. James) to my letter of the 10th of January 1846, in which I unequivocally denied this charge, it is admitted that the whole of this allegation is

ceded it—and been marked accordingly No. 6, and the latter No. 6. Such are the arts had recourse to for the purposes of deceiving,—if not the careful and circumspect, at least the more ready and less attentive reader—who, in the absence of any other evidence, will be apt to accept of this description, form the majority. For by the present false collocation of the above letters the false reader might infer that this retraction of the calumny had been made in consequence of my decisive denial, and refutation of it had been made by me. I have not appeared in addition that I had distinguishedly declined noticing this retraction.

When written before the last letter was received, an assertion of which I must be pardoned if I more than doubt the correctness,—inasmuch as to what is it a reply? Certainly not to my last letter, if only from the admission that it was, though only by one hour, written before that letter was received—nor to the one preceding it for that had been already replied to.—To what, then, was I indebted for the favour of

My direct unqualified denial, of every argument of probability, as well as in one instance the direct admission of error on the part of Mr. James _____, and the admissions of error, which have crept into his statement, no doubt inadvertently, on the part of Dr. McCrae.

The first series of charges, if I am allowed to deal with the general facts first, against me (see No. 4) and which were no doubt intended to send me "to Coventry amongst my pro-

have before observed, should have been marked 5) as follows:—"As to your second complaint, whoever was your informant, it is not a fact, as you unfoundedly falsehood without even one solid proof, calling of me to see, I saw your patient during your absence, consequently you must know that I never alarmed her fears, or denounced to her your treatment as inefficient, or recommended my own to her as that alone which could subdue her disease. I never saw your patient but twice, the first time in your own presence, the second in the presence of Dr. Richardson and

the only evidence in its support that it was not true. The context in the note of this person, Mr. James _____, namely, "but from her being much alarmed, and mentioning a strictly confidential purpose of the conversation that gentlemen had with _____ in my dining room, I naturally inferred such to have been the case." I have already shown to have been not less false than his original assertion, for the errors of which it was to apologize, account, inasmuch as, as I have before stated, that _____ had not asked me, or rather pressed me, to go up stairs, and see his wife, which I as positively de-

self, and so it continued until he charitably gave his testimony against himself in the enclosure, No. 8, wherein he is pleased to state as follows:—"That it was I who charged you before Dr. Richardson with suggesting that Mr. A'Beckett should be called in." Therefore, respecting the original charges, the testimony stands thus—in support of the first charge, (that I had arrived before eight), Mr. James ———; against it, myself, my coachman, and the argument of probability as explained.

In support of the second, the only charge of any weight, Mr. James ———; against it

his practice as improper, and recommending my
own as that which alone could subvert her disease."
The proof of this charge rests on the sole as-
sertion of Mr. James —; its disproof on
my equally plain contradiction.

Yet such were the charges, and previously
to any opportunity being offered to me for
explanation or defence, Dr. M'Crae had
deemed it prudent and honest to act, and to
initiate a series of measures which were, as
he has classically and elegantly termed it,
"to send me to Coventry" amongst my pro-
fessional brethren.

On the professional statements or miscel-

To the reader who may have time and inclination carefully to examine the statement of Dr. McCrae, I am well aware that, as the charges it contains respectively rest on the single unsupported evidence of Dr. McCrae or Mr James —, my mere explicit denial of them might be sufficient — and such was the view I first took of this matter, and a reply would have appeared in

I have the honour to be,
 Sir, Sir, Sir,
 W. BRAND,
 Pitt-street North, March 24th, 1866.

